DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 928 UD 016 826

AUTHOR Beusse, William E.; And Others
TITLE Perceptions of Equal Opportunity and Race Relations Among Military Personnel.
INSTITUTION Air Force Human Resources Lab., Lackland AFB, Tex. Personnel Research Div.
SPONS AGENCY Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs (DOD), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO AFHRI-TR-76-54; OASD MR 76-4
PUB DATE Dec 76
NOTE 28p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Armed Forces; *Caucasians; Enlisted Personnel; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Military Personnel; *Military Service; Minority Groups; *Negroes; *Race Relations; Racial Attitudes; Social Discrimination

ABSTRACT

This is a report of a survey conducted to determine the perceptions of equal opportunity and race relations among black and white military personnel in four branches of the Armed Forces. Data was collected by means of a questionnaire. Questionnaire items included the following areas: promotions, daily duty assignments, military justice, training opportunities, on-base social activities, respect by superiors, and housing. Furthermore, information on the perceptions of racial unrest and race relations among service personnel was solicited. The responses of 19,690 enlisted personnel and 3,160 officers from a stratified random sample comprised the data base. The responses were weighted so as to approximate the views of the total military population on active duty in October of 1973. An analysis of the data and an interpretation of the results are fully presented, in addition to comparisons of the perceptions between black and white enlisted personnel and black and white officers on several of the variables. (Author/BS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

4

AFHRL-TR-76-54

11 D

AIR FORCE HUMAN RESOURCES LABORATORY

PERCEPTIONS OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND RACE RELATIONS AMONG MILITARY PERSONNEL

By

William E. Beusse

Manpower Development and Evaluation Branch
Washington, D.C. 20301

Earl A. Waller
Forrest R. Ratliff, Lt Col, USAF

PERSONNEL RESEARCH DIVISION
Lackland Air Force Base, Texas 78236

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

December 1976

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

2

ED135928

UDO 16826

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND
BROOKS AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS 78235

MAR 1 1977

NOTICE

When US Government drawings, specifications, or other data are used for any purpose other than a definitely related Government procurement operation, the Government thereby incurs no responsibility nor any obligation whatsoever, and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise, as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use, or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

This final report was submitted by the Manpower Development and Evaluation Branch, Personnel Research Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, Lackland AFB, Texas 78236, to the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs).

This report has been reviewed and cleared for open publication and/or public release by the appropriate Office of Information (OI) in accordance with AFR 190-17 and DoDD 5230.9. There is no objection to unlimited distribution of this report to the public at large, or by DDC to the National Technical Information Service (NTIS).

This technical report has been reviewed and is approved.

LELAND D. BROKAW, Technical Director
Personnel Research Division

Approved for publication.

DAN D. FULGHAM, Colonel, USAF
Commander

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER AFHRL-TR-76-54 OASD MR 76-4	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) PERCEPTIONS OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND RACE RELATIONS AMONG MILITARY PERSONNEL		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final 6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) William E. Beusse Earl A. Waller Forrest R. Ratliff		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Manpower Development and Evaluation Branch Pentagon Washington, D.C. 20301		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 62703F 44990642
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS HQ Air Force Human Resources Laboratory (AFSC) Brooks Air Force Base, Texas 78235		12. REPORT DATE December 1976 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 26
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Office) Personnel Research Division Air Force Human Resources Laboratory Lackland Air Force Base, Texas 78236		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified 15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

equal opportunity
minority groups
race relations
race relations training
racial discrimination
racial unrest

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

The purpose of this study was to analyze the perceptions of equal opportunity and race relations among military personnel. Specific areas covered included promotions, duty assignments, military justice, training opportunities, social activities, respect by superiors, housing, perceptions of racial unrest and opinions about race relations training.

When the perceptions of Whites were compared with those of non-Whites, it was found that non-Whites generally perceived less opportunity for minority group members in most of the areas studied. Non-Whites were more likely than Whites to place a favorable evaluation on race relations training and to perceive improvement in race relations.

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

Item 20 (Continued)

Enlisted personnel were more likely than officers to perceive less opportunity for minority group members, more racial unrest, less improvement in race relations, and less value in the race relations training.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction	3
II.	Purpose and Method	3
III.	Perceptions of Equal Opportunity	4
IV.	Perceptions of Race Relations	9
V.	Participation in Race Relations Training	13
VI.	Summary and Conclusions	19
References		21
Appendix A.	Questionnaire Items	23

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Racial/Ethnic Composition of Data Base	4
2	Perceptions of Unequal Opportunity for Minority Groups by Service	5
3	Perceptions of Unequal Opportunity for Minority Groups by Pay Grade	6
4	Perceptions of Equal Opportunity by Racial Group	7
5	Perceptions of Minority Group Housing Discrimination by Service	8
6	Perceptions of Minority Group Housing Discrimination by Racial Group	8
7	Perceptions of Off-Base Housing Discrimination by Geographic Location of Duty Station	9
8	Percentages of Personnel Not in Racially Mixed Units	10
9	Perceptions of Racial Unrest Within Unit by Service	10
10	Perceptions of Racial Unrest by Racial Group	11

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table		Page
11	Perceptions of Racial Unrest by Pay Grade.	11
12	Perceptions of Changes in Race Relations by Service.	12
13	Perceptions of Changes in Race Relations by Racial Group . .	12
14	Perceptions of Changes in Race Relations by Pay Grade. . . .	13
15	Participation in Race Relations Training by Service.	14
16	Participation in Race Relations Training by Pay Grade. . . .	14
17	Evaluation of Race Relations Training by Services.	15
18	Evaluation of Race Relations Training by Racial Group. . . .	16
19	Evaluation of Race Relations Training.	16
20	Perceptions of Equal Opportunity by Participation. . . . . in Race Relations Training	17
21	Perceptions of Racial Unrest by Participation in . . . . . Race Relations Training	18
22	Perceptions of Changes in Race Relations by. . . . . Participation in Race Relations Training	19

PERCEPTIONS OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND RACE RELATIONS AMONG MILITARY PERSONNEL

I. INTRODUCTION

In August 1969, military and civilian leaders in the Department of Defense (DoD) and the military services signed a charter of "Human Goals," recognizing the dignity and worth of the individual and formally commiting the DoD to becoming a model for the just and effective use of human resources. The Human Goals charter was backed up by a number of specific policy statements. DoD Directive 1100.15, Equal Opportunity Within the Department of Defense, directs that equal opportunity and treatment shall be accorded to all military and civilian personnel, both on- and off-base, regardless of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. DoD Instruction 1100.16, Equal Opportunity in Off-Base Housing, addresses the problem of discrimination in local civilian housing and provides for the imposition of restrictive sanctions where violations are found. In 1971, DoD Directive 1322.11, Department of Defense Education in Race Relations for Armed Forces Personnel, was issued establishing a program of race relations training for military personnel.

The Deputy Assistant Secretary (Equal Opportunity) within the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) is charged with the responsibility for monitoring the DoD equal opportunity programs. Assessment of the progress made toward achieving equal opportunity requires a reliable information data base. DoD Directive 1100.15 established the requirement for uniform reporting systems to measure results. The information generated by this requirement consists of relatively objective measures such as promotion rates, assignment distributions, disciplinary action rates, etc. While such data provide some very useful information on the degree of success associated with equal opportunity programs, a broader approach is needed. An important element in the evaluation of equal opportunity efforts lies in the subjective judgments made by individual men and women throughout the Armed Services. For, as Coombs and Snygg (1959) point out:

> "People do not behave according to the facts as others see them. They behave according to the facts as they see them." (p. 17)

II. PURPOSE AND METHOD

The purpose of this report is to present data on the perceptions of equal opportunity and race relations among military personnel. The data were collected as part of a large, multi-purpose survey of military personnel within the four services. The survey was conducted in the fall

of 1973. Usable responses were received from 16,950 enlisted personnel and 13,160 officers. A complete description of the survey development, administration and processing has been reported elsewhere (Beusse, 1974). The data in this report represent the responses of the stratified random sample weighted so that results approximate the views of the total military population on active duty in October 1973.

Most studies of racial discrimination have found that attitudes tend to vary systematically dependent upon whether or not the respondents are members of minority groups. The racial/ethnic composition of the DoD-wide sample appears in Table 1. Due to the small percentages in some of the non-White categories, the data in Table 1 were collapsed into two categories for analysis purposes: White and non-White.

Table 1. Racial/Ethnic Composition of Data Base

Racial or Ethnic Group	Enlisted %	Officer %
Caucasian	80.1	95.3
Black	13.2	2.9
Spanish or Mexican American	4.1	.8
American Indian	1.3	.2
Asian American	1.2	.9

III. PERCEPTIONS OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

The questionnaire included a series of items inquiring about the extent to which military personnel perceive the existence of equal opportunity in a number of specific areas: promotions, daily duty assignments, military justice, training opportunities, on-base social activities, and respect by superiors. The applicable response alternatives were: (a) more than for other military personnel, (b) same as for all other military personnel, and (c) less than for other military personnel. Table 2 shows the percentage of officers and enlisted personnel in each service who perceive less opportunity for minority group members.

Table 2. Perceptions of Unequal Opportunity for Minority Groups by Service

Personnel	Army %	Navy %	Marine Corps %	Air Force %	All Services %
Enlisted:					
Promotions	16.8	8.3	16.4	7.9	11.9
Daily Duty Assignments	14.4	12.2	14.0	10.4	12.6
Military Justice	18.3	16.5	18.3	15.9	17.1
Training Opportunities	13.2	10.8	11.9	7.2	10.7
On-base Social Activities	16.4	10.6	14.6	12.8	13.7
Respect by Superiors	24.1	21.9	22.4	19.2	21.9
Officer:					
Promotions	3.5	4.8	1.9	3.2	3.6
Daily Duty Assignments	4.0	5.8	4.4	3.9	4.4
Military Justice	7.3	6.9	6.8	6.5	6.9
Training Opportunities	4.7	6.2	5.6	3.5	4.6
On-base Social Activities	8.4	12.3	8.2	9.0	9.5
Respect by Superiors	10.7	13.6	10.7	10.1	11.1

For both officer and enlisted personnel, "respect by superiors" is seen as the one area most lacking in equal opportunity. Officers perceive "on-base social activities" to be the second area of inequality, while enlisted personnel see more discrimination in "military justice." It should be noted that enlisted personnel perceive significantly less equal opportunity than officers in every area.

Perceptions of equal opportunity also vary by service. Among enlisted personnel, Army and Marine Corps members perceive less equal treatment than Navy and Air Force members in each area. Among the officers, the situation is somewhat different, with Naval officers generally perceiving less equal opportunity than officers in the other three services.

Table 3 shows the percentage of officers and enlisted personnel in all services perceiving less opportunity for minority group members distributed by pay grade groupings. For both officer and enlisted personnel, the higher the pay grade, the less likely the individual was to perceive discrimination.

Table 3. Perceptions of Unequal Opportunity for Minority Groups by Pay Grade

Area of Consideration	Enlisted Personnel E1-E3 %	Enlisted Personnel E4-E6 %	Enlisted Personnel E7-E9 %	Officers 01-02 %	Officers 03-04 %	Officers 05-06 %
Promotions	17.5	9.0	3.8	4.7	3.5	2.4
Daily Duty Assignments	16.1	11.4	3.9	5.9	4.1	2.3
Military Justice	20.1	16.1	10.0	8.2	6.7	4.8
Training Opportunities	15.2	8.3	4.1	5.9	4.6	3.2
On-base Social Activities	17.5	11.8	7.4	13.3	9.2	5.6
Respect by Superiors	25.7	20.7	12.5	12.9	11.1	8.0

In an address presented at the Navy Material Command Annual Equal Employment (EEO) Awards Dinner, Mr. H. Minton Francis, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Equal Opportunity), stated that people's attitudes toward equal opportunity programs "depend on whose ox is gored." That is, a program can be viewed as either providing equal opportunity or as reverse discrimination depending upon the vantage-point of the individual. Not unexpectedly, Table 4 shows that the perceptions of Whites and non-Whites differ significantly. A much higher proportion of non-Whites perceive less opportunity for minority group members. Generally speaking, Whites are more inclined than non-Whites to perceive the minority group member as receiving preferential treatment. In only one area, duty assignment do more non-White than White enlisted personnel perceive more preferential treatment for minority groups. However, in this same area, more non-Whites than Whites also perceive less preferential treatment. In the areas of promotions and training opportunities, there is very little difference between the percentage of Whites and non-Whites who perceive more preferential treatment for minorities, but more non-Whites perceive less opportunity than do Whites.

Table 4. Perceptions of Equal Opportunity by Racial Group

Do Minority Group Members Receive Equal Opportunity with regard to....?	Enlisted Personnel		Officers	
	Non-White	White	Non-White	White
	%	%	%	%
Promotions				
More than others	12.5	13.1	4.4	16.6
About the same	56.4	79.8	73.3	80.9
Less than others	31.1	7.1	22.3	2.5
Daily Duty Assignments				
More than others	18.6	12.1	4.4	6.4
About the same	65.8	76.1	84.2	89.6
Less than others	15.6	11.8	11.4	4.0
Military Justice				
More than others	13.6	21.7	7.4	18.8
About the same	55.7	64.6	68.1	75.2
Less than others	30.7	13.7	24.5	5.9
Training Opportunities				
More than others	9.8	10.6	3.0	13.0
About the same	65.7	82.2	78.1	83.2
Less than others	24.5	7.2	18.9	3.9
On-base Social Activities				
More than others	10.4	19.4	3.9	10.3
About the same	59.8	71.0	[illegible]2.9	81.0
Less than others	29.8	9.6	[illegible]23.2	8.7
Respect by Superiors				
More than others	10.0	13.8	3.6	8.3
About the same	51.1	68.5	65.6	81.6
Less than others	38.9	17.7	30.7	10.1

Servicemen were also queried on their perceptions of equal opportunity in on- and off-base housing. The distributions by service for officers and enlisted personnel appear in Table 5.

Table 5. Perceptions of Minority Group Housing Discrimination by Service

Personnel	Army %	Navy %	Marine Corps %	Air Force %	All Services %
Enlisted:					
On-base Discrimination*	14.9	22.7	26.9	14.3	18.6
Off-base Discrimination**	26.8	19.0	25.1	24.2	24.0
Officers:					
On-base Discrimination*	6.1	6.4	5.1	5.5	5.9
Off-base Discrimination**	22.8	21.1	23.8	18.0	20.7

* These percentages are based upon only those respondents who stated they had some knowledge of on-base housing assignments.

** These percentages include all respondents who reported knowledge of at least one specific instance of minority group discrimination.

As the information in Table 5 shows, officers are less likely than enlisted personnel to perceive housing discrimination, especially in reference to on-base housing. Among the services, naval enlisted personnel perceive the least discrimination in off-base housing while they and enlisted Marines perceive the most discrimination in on-base housing. Among officers, only slight differences exist among the services.

Table 6 shows the perceptions of housing discrimination among officers and enlisted personnel by minority group status. As would be expected, non-Whites were much more likely than Whites to perceive housing discrimination, both on- and off-base.

Table 6. Perceptions of Minority Group Housing Discrimination by Racial Group

Personnel	Non-Whites %	Whites %
Enlisted:		
On-base Housing Discrimination	35.4	15.0
Off-base Housing Discrimination	36.9	20.6
Officers:		
On-base Housing Discrimination	11.2	5.6
Off-base Housing Discrimination	40.7	19.7

Table 7 shows the percentage of officers and enlisted personnel reporting knowledge of specific instances of off-base housing discrimination by geographic area of duty station. Enlisted personnel stationed in the Far South-Central (Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee), Southwest (Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas), South Atlantic (Delaware, D.C., Florida, Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia), East North Central (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin), and foreign countries perceive the most discrimination. Officers stationed in the South and Southwest and in foreign countries reported the most discrimination.

Table 7. Perceptions of Off-Base Housing Discrimination by Geographic Location of Duty Station

Area of Duty Station	Enlisted Personnel %	Officers %
New England	15.8	19.1
Middle Atlantic	20.3	13.3
East North Central	26.7	14.0
West North Central	19.5	16.1
South Atlantic	26.5	24.0
Far South Central	31.2	23.8
Southwest	26.8	22.5
Mountain	22.6	15.5
Pacific	18.7	12.8
Hawaii or Alaska	21.3	19.0
Foreign Country	27.1	25.9

IV. PERCEPTIONS OF RACE RELATIONS

The survey questionnaire also sought to acquire information on the perceptions of racial unrest and race relations among service personnel. Table 8 shows the percentage of personnel in each service who indicated they were not in racially mixed units. A greater proportion of Navy enlisted personnel reported that all members of their units were of the same race. Among the officers, those in the Air Force and Navy were more likely to be assigned to racially homogeneous units. These respondents are excluded from the analysis of racial relations within the unit.

Table 8. Percentages of Personnel Not in Racially Mixed Units

	Army %	Navy %	Marine Corps %	Air Force %	All Services %
Enlisted	2.8	7.6	3.1	3.4	4.3
Officers	6.4	7.8	2.6	10.4	7.9

Table 9 shows the perceptions of racial unrest and tension by service. Consistent with other findings reported in this study, enlisted personnel were more likely than officers to perceive racial unrest. Enlisted personnel also were more likely to indicate they had no idea about the existence of racial tension. Some differences also existed among the services. Air Force enlisted personnel perceived the least amount of unrest while Marine Corps enlisted personnel perceived the most. Among officers, the situation was the same with Air Force officers indicating the lowest degree of unrest and Marine Corps officers reporting the highest.

Table 9. Perceptions of Racial Unrest Within Unit by Service

Existence of Racial Unrest in Unit?	Army %	Navy %	Marine Corps %	Air Force %	All Services %
Enlisted:					
Yes	37.4	37.3	42.5	23.5	33.7
No	49.9	51.8	44.1	60.0	52.9
No Idea	12.6	11.0	13.5	16.5	13.4
Officers:					
Yes	19.6	26.5	31.0	9.6	18.3
No	71.2	67.1	61.5	80.7	73.1
No Idea	9.2	6.3	7.5	9.7	8.6

Perceptions of racial unrest were also found to vary by racial group (Table 10). Non-Whites, both officer and enlisted, were more likely than Whites to perceive racial tension.

Table 10. Perceptions of Racial Unrest by Racial Group

Racial Group	Percentage Perceiving Racial Unrest %
Enlisted:	
Non-Whites	41.2
Whites	31.8
Officers:	
Non-Whites	25.2
Whites	17.9

Pay grade was found to be inversely related to perceptions of racial unrest (Table 11). That is, the higher the individual's pay grade, the less likely he was to perceive the existence of racial unrest.

Table 11. Perceptions of Racial Unrest by Pay Grade

Grade	Percentage Perceiving Racial Unrest %
Enlisted:	
E1 to E3	40.5
E4 to E6	30.4
E7 to E9	21.4
Officers:	
01 and 02	23.5
03 and 04	16.0
05 and 06	14.6

The respondents were also asked whether they felt race relations in their unit had changed during the past year. Table 12 shows the distribution of responses by service. In general, officers were more likely than enlisted personnel to have perceived improved race relations and much less likely to have perceived a worsening of relations. Some differences were also found among the services. Army enlisted personnel were more likely than others to report improvement. Among officers, those in the Navy were most likely to report improvement.

Table 12. Perceptions of Changes in Race Relations by Service

Status of Race Relations	Army %	Navy %	Marine Corps %	Air Force %	All Services %
Enlisted:					
Improved	28.5	24.0	24.5	23.5	25.5
No Change	30.5	38.2	30.5	36.6	34.3
Worsened	13.4	14.8	16.2	7.7	12.3
No Idea	27.5	23.1	28.7	32.2	27.9
Officers:					
Improved	32.5	36.9	31.1	20.9	29.1
No Change	40.2	44.2	40.0	48.0	43.9
Worsened	3.8	6.1	5.6	2.1	3.8
No Idea	23.5	12.8	23.4	29.0	23.2

Table 13 shows the perception of race relations change by racial group. Among both officer and enlisted personnel, the non-Whites were more likely to have indicated that race relations had improved over the past year.

Table 13. Perceptions of Changes in Race Relations by Racial Group

Status of Race Relations	Enlisted Personnel Non-White %	Enlisted Personnel White %	Officers Non-White %	Officers White %
Improved	30.4	24.3	34.9	28.9
No change	29.1	35.7	34.9	44.3
Worsened	10.5	12.7	4.2	3.8
No Idea	30.0	27.4	26.1	23.0

Beliefs regarding the progress of race relations were also found to vary with pay grade. Among enlisted personnel, the higher the individual's pay grade, the more likely he was to have reported improvement in race relations (Table 14). The perception of improved race relations did not vary significantly among officers of different grades.

Table 14. Perceptions of Changes in Race Relations by Pay Grade

Pay Grade	Status of Race Relations: Improved %	No Change %	Worsened %	No Idea %
Enlisted:				
E1 to E3	21.2	28.9	14.4	35.5
E4 to E6	27.4	37.8	11.5	23.4
E7 to E9	34.6	39.2	7.6	18.6
Officers:				
01 and 02	30.6	38.3	4.5	26.6
03 and 04	27.5	45.5	3.5	23.5
05 and 06	30.5	49.1	2.0	18.4

V. PARTICIPATION IN RACE RELATIONS TRAINING

DoD Directive 1322.11 provides for a comprehensive race relations education program. The Defense Race Relations Institute at Patrick AFB, Florida, currently graduates about 2,000 race relations instructors a year for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The Marine Corps has a similar program at their Human Relations Institute in San Diego. The instructors graduating from these programs comprise the cadre for the service race relations training programs.

Table 15 shows the proportion of service personnel who reported receiving race relations training during the past year. About three-quarters of all officer and enlisted personnel received some race relations training. Among the enlisted population, the Army had the highest participation rate and the Navy the lowest. Among officers, the Marine Corps had the highest percentage of participants while the Navy and Air Force had the lowest.

Table 15. Participation in Race Relations Training by Service

Military Service	Enlisted Personnel %	Officers %
Army	83.7	81.8
Navy	63.?	67.1
Marine Corps	80.6	94.6
Air Force	75.3	67.7
All Services	75.6	74.2

Non-Whites were somewhat more likely to have received race relations training than Whites with 80.4 percent of the enlisted non-Whites and 77.4 percent of the non-White officers participating comparing to 74.5 percent of the enlisted Whites and 74.0 percent of the White officers.

Participation in race relations training was found to vary by pay grade (Table 16). Those enlisted personnel serving in pay grades E7 or above were more likely than lower pay grade personnel to have received training. Among officers, the higher the individual's pay grade, the less likely it is that he participated in a race relations education program.

Table 16. Participation in Race Relations Training by Pay Grade

Pay Grade	Proportion Who Received Some Race Relations Training During the Past Year %
Enlisted:	
E1 to E3	75.0
E4 to E6	74.7
E7 to E9	83.5
Officers:	
01 and 02	79.3
03 and 04	71.9
05 and 06	69.1

Those individuals who received race relations training were also asked to assess the value of the program. The results of their evaluations by service appear in Table 17. About half of the enlisted personnel who participated considered the program to be "of little value," while 31.5 percent believed it to be "of some value," and 18.7 percent indicated it was "very worthwhile." There seemed to be only minor differences among the services with Army enlisted personnel being somewhat more likely to have given the race relations education program a favorable rating. Among the officers, 43 percent rated the race relations education program as being "of little value," 40 percent "of some value," and 17 percent "very worthwhile." Navy officers were more likely to give the program a favorable assessment, while Marine Corps officers reported the least favorable evaluation.

Table 17. Evaluation of Race Relations Training by Service

Evaluation of Race Relations Training	Army %	Navy %	Marine Corps %	Air Force Force %	All Services %
Enlisted:					
Very Worthwhile	20.4	17.4	16.9	17.9	18.7
Of Some Value	32.2	31.8	31.0	30.4	31.5
Of Little Value	47.4	50.7	52.1	51.8	49.8
Officers:					
Very Worthwhile	17.4	19.8	8.9	16.8	17.0
Of Some Value	39.2	42.4	37.2	40.2	40.0
Of Little Value	43.4	37.8	53.9	43.0	43.0

Assessment of the value of the race relations training program varied by racial group. Among both officers and enlisted personnel, non-Whites were much more likely than Whites to evaluate the program in favorable terms (Table 18).

Table 18. Evaluation of Race Relations Training by Racial Group

Racial Group	Evaluation of Race Relations Training: Very Worthwhile %	Of Some Value %	Of Little Value %
Enlisted:			
Non-White	29.8	32.7	37.5
White	15.6	31.2	53.2
Officers:			
Non-White	35.9	36.2	27.9
White	16.0	40.2	43.8

Analysis of program evaluation by pay grade revealed a slight tendency for senior non-commissioned officers and officers to have given race relations training a favorable rating (Table 19).

Table 19. Evaluation of Race Relations Training

Pay Grade	Evaluation of Race Relations Training: Very Worthwhile %	Of Some Value %	Of Little Value %
Enlisted:			
E1 to E3	19.0	31.6	49.3
E4 to E6	18.2	30.8	51.0
E7 to E9	19.4	33.9	46.7
Officers:			
01 and 02	16.5	39.9	43.6
03 and 04	17.1	39.7	43.2
05 and 06	18.9	42.9	38.2

According to DoD Directive 1322.11, the general goals of the education program in race relations is "to improve and achieve equal opportunity with

the DoD in keeping with the Human Goals proclaimed on August 18, 1969, and to eliminate and prevent racial tensions, unrest, and violence." To achieve these goals, one of the objectives of the program is to sensitize service personnel to the issues and problems related to equal opportunity and racial conflict. To the extent this objective is being achieved, it is expected that the perceptions of those personnel who received race relations training would differ from those held by non-participants. Table 20 shows the distribution of perceptions of equal opportunity for trained and untrained personnel.

Table 20. Perceptions of Equal Opportunity by Participation in Race Relations Training

Do minority group members receive equal opportunity with regard to....?	Enlisted Personnel		Officers	
	Rec'd Race Trng %	Didn't Receive Trng %	Rec'd Race Trng %	Didn't Receive Trng %
Promotions:				
More than others	13.9	9.8	16.5	14.3
About the same	74.2	78.3	79.8	82.6
Less than others	11.9	11.9	3.7	3.1
Daily Duty Assignments:				
More than others	13.7	12.6	6.6	5.1
About the same	73.9	74.3	88.9	90.8
Less than others	12.4	13.1	4.5	4.1
Military Justice:				
More than others	19.9	20.6	19.1	15.6
About the same	63.3	61.3	73.8	78.4
Less than others	16.8	18.1	7.2	6.0
Training Opportunities:				
More than others	10.8	9.2	12.9	11.1
About the same	78.3	80.6	82.2	84.9
Less than others	10.9	10.2	4.9	4.0
On-base Social Activities:				
More than others	18.5	15.0	10.9	7.2
About the same	67.6	72.0	79.1	85.1
Less than others	13.9	13.0	10.1	7.7
Respect by Superiors:				
More than others	13.1	12.8	8.6	6.3
About the same	65.3	64.2	79.9	83.4
Less than others	21.6	23.0	11.4	10.3

Among the enlisted personnel, there is a high degree of similarity between the perceptions of race relations training recipients and non-recipients. This would tend to indicate that race relations training has not had a major impact on the perceptions of the participants.

Among officers, race relations training appears to have had only a small effect upon the perceptions of participants. The direction of the effect, however, is mixed. For each area, officers who received race relations training were more likely than those who did not receive training to see minority group members as having both more and less opportunity than others. Although the differences are quite small, the systematic nature of the variation implies some degree of relationship.

Analysis of the association between receipt of race relations training and perceptions of racial unrest revealed that race relations trained enlisted personnel were only slightly more likely than untrained personnel to perceive racial tension in their unit (Table 21). Those officers who had received race relations training were much more likely than untrained officers to perceive the existence of racial unrest.

Table 21. Perceptions of Racial Unrest by Participation in Race Relations Training

Race Relations Training Experience	Proportion Receiving Racial Unrest %
Enlisted:	
Received Training	34.3
Did Not Receive Training	31.8
Officers:	
Received Training	20.4
Did Not Receive Training	11.7

Table 22 shows the distribution of perceptions regarding changes in race relations over the past year for race relations trained and untrained personnel. Among both enlisted personnel and officers, those who received race relations training were more likely to have formed an opinion of the progress of race relations. Also, among both officer and enlisted personnel, those who had received training were more likely to have perceived improvement in race relations.

Table 22. Perceptions of Changes in Race Relations by Participation in Race Relations Training

Race Relations Training Experience	Perceptions of Changes During Past Year: Improved %	No Change %	Worsened %	No Idea %
Enlisted:				
Received Training	27.7	33.6	12.2	26.5
Did Not Receive Training	18.6	36.5	12.6	32.2
Officers:				
Received Training	33.4	41.8	4.3	20.5
Did Not Receive Training	16.8	50.0	2.2	31.0

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to analyze the perceptions of military personnel regarding equal opportunity and race relations in the Armed Forces. The findings throughout the report are quite consistent. When the perceptions of Whites were compared with non-Whites, it was found that non-Whites generally perceived (1) less opportunity for minority group members in the areas of promotions, military justice, training opportunities, on-base social activities, and respect for superiors, (2) more housing discrimination, and (3) more racial unrest. Non-Whites were also more likely than Whites to (1) have received race relations training during the past year, (2) place a favorable evaluation upon the race relations training program, and (3) perceive some improvement in race relations over the past year.

When the perceptions of officers were compared to those of enlisted personnel, it was found that enlisted personnel generally perceived (1) less opportunity for minority group members in all areas, (2) more racial unrest, (3) less improvement in race relations, and (4) less value in the race relations training program.

When perceptions within the officer grades and the enlisted ranks were analyzed by pay grade, it was found that those in the lower pay grades of each group were more likely to (1) perceive less opportunity for minority group members and (2) perceive more racial unrest. Lower ranking enlisted men had a more pessimistic view of recent changes in

race relations than did higher ranking personnel, but officers did not differ by grade with respect to this perception.

The pattern of results outlined above reveals two important points. First, there are differences in the perceptions of Whites and non-Whites with respect to the equality of opportunity afforded minority groups. Moreover, there is also a tendency for some Whites to believe minority group members receive preferential treatment. This indicates that affirmative action programs will continue to have a very narrow path to follow in order to be effective and avoid the charge of reverse discrimination. Second, a gulf exists between the perceptions of the leaders and those of the led. Officers consistently expressed a more optimistic view than did enlisted personnel. Also, within each of these groups, the higher grades were more optimistic than the lower grades. Whether one group's perceptions are more or less accurate than another's is not really the point. The main problem lies in the disparity of views expressed by these groups. If the leadership is insensitive, either to the lack of equal opportunity or the perception of the lack of equal opportunity among subordinates, problems are likely to result.

The analysis of particpation in an assessment of race relations training also revealed some interesting results. The groups with the highest participation were senior NCOs and junior officers. The assessment of both officers and enlisted personnel regarding the value of this training was not particularly favorable. In analyzing the relationship between race relations training and perceptions, it was found that there was almost no difference between trained and untrained enlisted personnel in their perceptions of equal opportunity. Among officers, those with race relations training were slightly less likely to perceive no difference in opportunity and more likely to perceive either discrimination or reverse discrimination. However, officer and enlisted personnel trained in race relations were more likely to perceive the existence of racial unrest. Thus, there seems to be a paradox; while personnel trained in race relations do recognize more racial unrest, they do not recognize less equal opportunity. This may be an accurate reflection of the situation, that is, the services do provide equal opportunities to minority groups as reported by the vast majority of the respondents, or it may indicate a failure on the part of the race relations education program to sensitize personnel to a possible lack of equal opportunity.

In conclusion, the results of this study indicate that although some changes have occurred attributable to race relations training, they are of small magnitude and in only a few areas, indicating that if the goals set forth are to be reached, other concepts or methods must be considered.

REFERENCES

Buesse, W. E. Documentation of the 1973 DoD personnel survey. MR 74-11, OASD (M&RA), May 1974.

Coombs, A. W., & Snygg, D. Individual behavior. Rev. ed., 1959, Text Edition, Harper-Row.

DoD Directive 1100.15. Equal Opportunity within the Department of Defense. ASD (M&RA), December 14, 1970.

DoD Instruction 1100.16. Equal opportunity in off-base housing. ASD (M&RA), February 28, 1973.

DoD Directive 1322.11. Department of Defense education in race relations for Armed Forces personnel. ASD (M&RA), August 6, 1973.

To what extent does equal opportunity for military personnel who are members of minority groups exist in your unit in the areas listed below? (Questions 58 through 63)

Use the following responses:

A. More than for other military personnel
B. Same as for all other military personnel
C. Less than for other military personnel
D. There are no military personnel who are members of minority groups in my unit

58. Promotion opportunities?

59. Daily duty assignments?

60. Military justice?

61. Training opportunities?

62. On-base (on-post) clubs and social activities?

63. Respect shown by superiors?

64. Do you know of any specific instances of discrimination against military personnel who are members of minority groups in sale or rental of civilian housing near your base?

A. No
B. Yes, a great many
C. Yes, some
D. Yes, but very few

65. Do you think there is equal opportunity for military personnel who are members of minority groups in the assignment of on-base family housing in your unit?

A. No
B. Yes
C. I have no idea

66. Is there racial unrest and tension between Whites and Blacks in your unit?

A. Not applicable, all members of my unit are the same race
B. Yes
C. No
D. I have no idea

67. Do you think race relations in your present unit have changed in the past year?

A. Improved
B. No change
C. Worsened
D. I have no idea

69. What is your opinion of the race relations training you received during the past year?

A. Very worthwhile
B. Of some value
C. Of little value
D. I did not receive such training

24 ☆U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1977-771-057/24